
ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – GNSO: NCSG Policy Committee Meeting
Tuesday, October 26, 2021 – 10:30 to 12:00 PDT

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Thank you very much. Hi, everyone, and welcome to the NCSG Policy Committee Meeting. My name is Maryam Bakoshi, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper format as noted in the chat. I will read questions or comments aloud during the set time by the chair of this session.

If you'd like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you're done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand over the floor to the chair of the NCSG Policy Committee, Tomslin Samme-Nlar. Tomslin, please.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you, Maryam. And welcome, everyone, to our policy committee meeting at ICANN72. We usually take this opportunity to also prepare for the GNSO Council meeting, so we will be looking at that as well today. We also usually look at one of the tools of the GNSO Council which is the auction decision. Rather, I think it's not really a GNSO Council [inaudible]. It's for the whole community now. We use that to identify any upcoming work within a 0-3 months' range that might be of interest to NCSG. And we bring members up to speed on them.

So that is what is the first item on our agenda today before we move on to the GNSO Council agenda which Tatiana will help us with. So to our first item, like I mentioned, we look at the ADR, Action Decision Radar., too, and look at what items impact or are of interest to NCSG within the 0-3 months, every month usually.

I just wanted to say, for this period, there is not ... Most of the items that are keeping the GNSO Council busy are operations items, really, since we are at an AGM and the new policy year is starting. So that's not surprising.

However, a couple that I think will be keeping the Council busy ... One of them is the RPM Phase 2 UDRP PDP, I believe that will be of interest to NCSG. The Policy Status Report which staff is working on initiating, [albeit] there are some concerns from some stakeholder groups relating to whether ICANN staff should be producing the Policy Status Report or we should be asking expert providers like WIPO.

The other item is that the Council is expecting, I think will be expecting, a report from the newly updated work track to an EPDP. That's the

EPDP Specific Curative Rights Protections for IGOs, I think in December this year.

Those are the only things ... Well, not the only but the main ones within the 0-3-month range keeping the Council busy. There are others which we'll be discussing during the Council meeting this week. And those will be covered in Tatiana's update and walkthrough of the Council meeting.

So with that, I'll pause to see if there are any questions before we move to Tatiana to present the Council agenda. Seeing no hands raised, we'll move to the Council agenda then. Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Thank you very much, Tomslin. And hello to all the participants who are here. I would like to ask you to be patient because I'm going to share my screen and I hope that you can see it.

So I am going to cover only the agenda Part 1. This is where I am going to take part. However, I would like you to bear in mind that there will be Part 2, the admin meeting where the newly-seated Council is going to elect a chair. But I think that this is not something that we have to worry about because we have only one candidate. And I cannot imagine that we're going to vote him down.

So let me then cover the main meeting agenda. Part 1 will take place tomorrow, and hopefully I will see all. Apparently I will see all of our councilors, but I also hope that of you who are in this room are going to attend the meeting.

So about the agenda itself, of course, as usual it starts with a roll call and some administrative matters and updates to the Statements of Interest and minutes of the previous meetings and opening remarks. I will go directly here to the voting and discussion items. The first item is the consent agenda here, and on the consent agenda we have the approval of the appointee. And I'm saying "appointee" because there is the same person for two positions.

The first one is the GNSO Council liaison to the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures ODP, Operational Design Phase. This is the appointment which was selected by the Standing Selection Committee, and it Jeff Neuman. And the same Jeff, our very own GNSO Jeff, is also going to be approved as a part of the consent agenda as the GNSO liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee.

I know that for many of you, he has not been a stranger because he already served at the GNSO liaison in the year before, so this cycle which we are currently finishing at this AGM.

I also wanted to ask you, our members, whoever wants to speak, please raise your hand. I am monitoring the hands. I can't monitor the chat for now. I will look at it from time to time. And of course I will pause to take any questions. But please, if you have a question raise your hand. It's much easier for me.

I see no hands. Are there any questions or comments about the agenda Item #3? And seeing none, I'm going to agenda Item #4 which is, again, a vote. And this is the vote which require a supermajority. And this is the vote for the EPDP Phase 2 Final Report. Well, I don't think I have to

explain to anybody here what EPDP Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 2A is. And the Phase 2A has been the subject of some discussions already at this ICANN meeting. For example, those of you who attended the GNSO/GAC meeting yesterday, we have noticed that the GAC noted that there were many minority statements that they support to which the GNSO reiterated that minority statements are a part of this process. So what is in the agenda is to actually vote on this report.

I'm not aware of any issues that would prevent NCSG councilors from voting for this report. However, if you have any other opinion, I know that we have Manju and Stephanie on this call. So feel free to chime in, but please raise your hand so I can see who of you goes first, if you want. Because if you don't want to speak, it's fine. I just want to say that I seconded this motion and I do not see any reason why we should vote this support down.

Anything anyone wants to add? Yes, so I see that Manju and Stephanie are agreeing with me on the chat. So then I will skip this item because, through this process, I think we've got enough updates from the NCSG members on that EPDP Phase 2A. I don't think we have anything to discuss here right now.

And I'm going to vote on the ... Oh, sorry. Vote. I would like to vote, of course, on the agenda Item #5. But it is increasingly unlikely that this is going to happen, so what's the point here?

We have got some proposals to revise the GNSO Council NomCom appointee job description for the Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee starts its new cycle quite soon. I think by

December/January, perhaps. And the leadership, with some support also from the membership, some of the members proposed to send the revised description for the GNSO Council job to NomCom to ask the non-gone to try and select the non-affiliated appointees, the appointees that are not affiliated with any other group strongly.

However, there has been some discussion on the list that this requires further clarification, further discussion. So while we have the motion submitted by Pam Little and seconded by our very own Tomlin, I think that there might be a situation where this Council vote will not happen and we will just have a discussion to perhaps defer this vote to the next Council meeting.

I'm not sure if this is going to happen or not, but seeing the activity on the list, because the Registries Stakeholder Group said that we need a discussion. The IPC said that we need a discussion. And of course we have to react. And perhaps instead of the vote, we are going to have a discussion about this description.

Now I see Stephanie's comment about the discussion being suggested in rather not-good faith. Well, I would say that I wouldn't mind for this motion to be postponed, although I strongly think that we have to vote for this.

But I do believe that if we have some concerns expressed by the representatives of both houses of the Council, we'd probably better look at this closely and go through yet another round of discussions to ensure that at least everybody could voice their opinion and propose some changes, if needed.

I see that Tomslin has his hand up. So Tomslin, please go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yeah. I think Manju has just said that ... I thought Stephanie's comment was on EPDP Phase 2A. But for this—

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm sorry. I'm horribly sorry. It's just because it came when I was talking about the NomCom.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Yes, yes. But for the NomCom one, I'm certain that [were to be] deferred. And I think they have requested for further discussion which the Registries Stakeholder Group has also supported that we discuss it and not vote for it. So I think that is most likely the outcome that we'll see. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Tomslin. So, yeah, I guess it's going to be differed. But as much as I want this vote to happen, I really understand that when we have some concerns, we're better to discuss them. And as the NomCom starts their cycle in a couple of months, hopefully this job description is going to be in time for the start of the new NomCom.

Yes, Stephanie. Thank you. And I'm sorry. I'm terribly sorry that I didn't recognize that your comment was about the EPDP Phase 2A.

Any questions or comments about the NomCom? Yeah. I see that Stephanie wouldn't mind deferral. Right. Any further questions or comments about the agenda Item #5?

Seeing no hands, I'm going to the agenda Item #6. And we have a Council discussion on the GDS. So an ICANN Org on the Framework for the Policy Status Report for the UDRP. And for those of you who have been following the GNSO Council work in the last few months, this process kicked off a few meetings ago after the GNSO Council approved the recommendations from the Phase 1 Final Report on the RPMs in all gTLDs.

So this discussion is ongoing, and the Policy Status Report Framework is currently ... I mean the ball is currently on the ICANN Org work and we are waiting for the updates to see how this is going to proceed. So we are going to receive a presentation from the ICANN Org, and we are going to discuss the presentation. So there is nothing that I can actually say here.

I think that will just follow this discussion and remember that with the previous comments, Tomslin and I were intervening and saying ... Because there were some suggestions from certain stakeholders that, for example, some intergovernmental organizations should do some job in this regard. But we were saying that this is a wider effort. And I think that what we can do here at this meeting [inaudible] just stand firmly on our ground.

Tomslin, do you want to add something here or do you think I covered it pretty much in line with what we want to do?

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Absolutely, Tatiana. Yes, there is a strong push for this to be given to WIPO to do this. But like Tatiana said, we believe it should be a wider effort and should involve the community, not completely outsourced. So we plan to also push for that and stand on that as well. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes. So basically I do agree that WIPO has a lot of expertise and a lot of data there and they can have ... Really, they can play some sort of instrumental role in providing this data and providing information. But I also believe that the ICANN Org and we have to look at other sources. So sort of aggregate them.

So not trying to make it a dichotomy either/or. But rather the idea of inclusiveness of looking at various venues and avenues while, of course, bearing in mind that WIPO can have a lot of information and can provide a lot of help on this.

All right. Any other comments or questions about this agenda item? I see no hands for now.

So the Item #7 is going to be Any Other Business. And the items here, it's a bit packed. The item on, first of all, seeking a vice-chair for Standing Committee on ICANN Budget and Operating Plan. So to prepare for chair succession for the financial year 2024 cycle. Then acknowledgement of the Project Plan for the EPDP on Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). So this is something for us to consider.

The IDN PDP just started its work, and those of you who attended the policy update before ICANN probably saw that it will take at least a year for them to arrive to the final results. So this is where probably the plan would be presented and we will acknowledge it.

Then we will discuss the potential next steps for the Board response to the Council’s letter regarding the Request for Continued Deferral on IDN Implementation Guidelines Version 4.0.” This is something connected to the EPDP on Internationalized Domain Names, and this is something that came strongly from the Contracted Party House who thinks that many of these issues which are covered in the IDN Implementation Guidelines should be looked at in the context of policy to avoid any conflicts. And we are going to discuss the Board response to this request.

There will be a suggestion discussed to assign a Council liaison to the Accuracy Scoping Team. Because it's not actually a PDP yet or EPDP or whatever. It probably would be a PDP if it starts. So the Scoping Team, of course, formally I don't think needs a liaison. But taking into account how contentious this issue has been and how important it is on the agenda of the GNSO and many parts of the community, we would consider that perhaps it would be good for the GNSO Council to assign a liaison.

I see a hand up, Tomslin. Please, go ahead.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: That was my hand up to just make a comment that Farell will be giving us an update today on the IDN EPDP so that we know what's been happening there and what to look out for. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you, Tomslin. Thank you. Any further questions or comments?

Stephanie, I'm the same as Tomslin. I was informed about the name, but at the end of the long day full of various meetings, it just escapes me. But there will be new ALAC liaison, so it will surely be announced and we will all know the name.

Now the 7.5 item is a bit of a sad item for me because there will be a farewell to outgoing councilors like Carlton, Osvaldo, Pam, Tom, me. And to Cheryl who served as ALAC liaison to the GNSO for as long as I remember myself being on the Council. So she's also leaving this liaison position. So we have quite a big change on the Council.

And there will be an open microphone. Anything? Any comments? Any questions for now? I'm trying to see if I can go directly to the agenda of the Part 2 of the meeting. I just want you to give me a moment.

So the Part 2, as I said, this is something where I'm not going to be present. No, I am going to be present, but not as a Council almost from the beginning. So there will be new councilor seated on this Council. And we have the new councilor there, Manju Chen.

Then the new [inaudible] Council is going to elect the chair. And this is something that the leadership proposed because we have only one candidate. It's going to happen with the roll call vote.

Stephanie, please go ahead. Your hand is up.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes. I was just way behind you there just saying how sad it is that you're leaving. And I hope you're going to stick around because we need your advice as we move forward. I realize there's probably plenty of time to say that later, but it's very sad. Thanks.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Oh, thank you, Stephanie. I will surely stay around because I was selected by the NomCom for the ccNSO Council. So I'm changing Councils and I am going to look at the other side of the TLDs. But of course, for the NCSG, I hope that you can rely on me maybe to the lesser extent because for the next three years I would be sort of bound with another Council. But surely I can contribute here as well.

Now Stephanie, is this the old hand? Right, so that was ...

And then the third agenda item is the election of the vice-chair. And we'll have our very own Tomslin who is going to replace me being vice-chair, and I'm sure that is going to be an amazing replacement.

Tomslin, I know that this is quite a heavy lifting, this position. But it's also a very interesting position and there is a lot of fun and interaction and communication out there. So good luck and, yeah, I wish you all

the best. And I'm sure that you would be an awesome replacement and a great representation of the Non-Contracted Parties House.

And from the Contracted Party House, we will have Sebastien Ducos as the vice-chair.

Then there would be Any Other Business like confirming the GNSO chair as Interim Decisional Participant Representative to the Empowered Community. And this is more or less an admin meeting with seating the Council, electing the chair, confirming various things.

And here, after Part 2, the new cycle, the new year is going to begin for the Council and the GNSO.

Now, Tomslin, you have your hand up. But I was going to wrap up anyway and hand it over to you.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Is my hand's still up? I thought I put it down. No, I was just going to say thanks. About the vice-chair, I know that your shoes are too big to fill, so I'll come with mine. But thank you for the amazing work you've done for the Council. And we will definitely miss you. Yes. That's it for now. We're hoping to wish you give you a formal thanks at the end, but we'll see how that goes after this meeting.

So thank you, Tatiana. I guess this is your last ... Bruna, I see your hand up. I'll come to you in a moment. So this is your last meeting you're covering in the GNSO agenda, I guess. So thank you for [having done] [inaudible] the last cycle. So thank you very much.

Bruna.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Just to take the opportunity to add to the thanks for Tatiana on this. It's really sad to see and hear her in her last Council briefing or whatever the name of this part of the meeting—updates from the Council meeting. And as everyone has said, you have been, Tatiana, one of the key persons in this community, and it's really relevant for us to have you both as an example, but also as somebody to rely on. Either if that's for personal advise or for ICANN advise. It's just kind of sad to see you go, and I'm just [inaudible] good and very long thank you. You know how much I admire and like you, so thank you so much for your work and for your dedication in the past years.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Tatiana, yes.

TATIANA TROPINA:

Tomslin, I'm going to jump in. Well, first of all, I'm trying not to cry here. But I also want to say that not going anywhere. I'm here. I'm around and will always be friends with those of you who know me. So please don't hesitate. Not even don't hesitate. Please do reach out. And hopefully we will see each other again very soon. And I also want to say that I am really glad and so happy to see people like Tomslin, like Manchu coming in here because I learned a lot from Rafik, I learned a lot from Milton, I learned a lot from Avri who are sort of moving around in this space.

Avri's in the Board. Milton is not here on this call. Rafik left his position as vice-chair.

I've always felt like I have to just continue what they're doing. And I do believe that both Tomslin and Manchu can continue what we have been doing. And this is why I'm so happy to see these two names taking these positions and going to be active. I surely know that they are. So good luck to you all. And thank you, Bruna and Tomslin.

Tomslin, you can remove my name from the AOB [inaudible] more or less operating.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I don't have editing rights to it, but ... No, I'm just kidding.

TATIANA TROPINA: Just use your superpower.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Thank you again, Tatiana. We'll move on to, I think, some policy updates which are missing on this agenda. And that's my mistake. So there are three policy efforts that are going on where we have representatives, active ones that is, that are going on that we have representatives there. And I thought we'd have some updates from those.

Now we were expecting an update from the Transfer Policy, but I believe both Farzaneh and Wisdom are not here today. They sent apologies. I'll just quickly ...

Farzaneh did send an update on the mailing list. And for those who do not know, the Transfer Policy has a mission and scope to conduct Holistic Review of the gTLD Transfer Policy and determine if changes to the policy are needed to improve the ease, security, and efficacy of inter-registrar and inter-registrant transfers. And Farzaneh mentioned on the list that they are advocated for enhanced security in the working group.

And they have also asked that some processes that could potentially impact privacy of domain name registrants also be removed. And they're supporting not using the word "identification" when defining various Auth-Codes. She did send an e-mail on the mailing list with a slide pack which anyone interested in this could go through that, please.

Maybe I should pause for a second and see if there are any comments or hands raised. I don't see. With none, I'll move to the next EPDP.

The IDNs EPDP which is tasked to provide recommendations to the GNSO Council with the definition and management of gTLD variant labels to facilitate the delegation of variant gTLDs in the root zone while achieving security and usability goals of variant levels. And also how the IDN Implementation Guidelines should be updated in the future.

So the Council liaison to this EPDP is Farell, and he has kindly accepted to give us an update today. So I'll pass it to Farell to give us an update on how that EPDP is going. Farell, the floor is yours.

FARELL FOLLY:

Thanks, Tomslin. Hello, everyone. I'm glad to be on the call, as usual. As you pointed out, I'm the liaison to the EPDP on IDNs, but I'm not doing the presentation, of course, as a liaison, but just as a member of the NCSG. So what I will be doing is not reflecting the Council position or any leadership position that might be related.

So you all know that following the latest IDN Guidelines, two main gaps had been found regarding the implementation of the IDN variant. So the first one was that there was no common accepted definition of what an IDN variant is. And also, the second gap that was found is that there is no way as pertains to how to manage actually those IDN variants.

So the GNSO has decided to launch a call to set up an IDN Scoping Team to look at the IDN Guidelines version 4 and some IDN variant TLD recommendations. And this actually led to a final report that was published one year ago on 17 February 2020.

And then the task of this EPDP is to define, manage, and coordinate the IDN variant TLDs, and of course how those guidelines should be revised or revisited in the future.

So this is how this EPDP has been launched. They built up a charter, and following the charter they appointed a chair. The first chair was Edmon Chung, but actually after two [or three] weeks of initial work, Edmon

Chung has been appointed to the ICANN Board of Directors. So we got to select a new chair who is actually Donna Austin, seconded by Justine Chew as the vice-chair.

So the charter has a question, mostly seven questions that we have to answer and write a report on that like we usually do for any PDP. And the question here [inaudible] TLD validation and variant calculation. And there, they are like a way to find a consistent definition and technical utilization of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. And there are like 1-10 questions to answer.

And regarding the IDN variant [inaudible], they are questions related to the same entity at the top level, the same entity at the second level, and then some adjustments that may be [inaudible] and in the [inaudible] process and also in dispute resolution procedure. And the last part will concern the IDN implementation guideline.

So those are the charter questions that the EPDP has been tasked to look at. And actually, we'll be having a meeting later today. It will be tomorrow in my time, 2:00 A.M. more or less. But it might be another time in different time zones. And the agenda for today, principally, would be to get some updates from the ccPDP4 and continue deliberation on topic A. And then topic A, as I said, is a consistent definition and technical utilization of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules.

And we are here dealing with question [a3]. And this question, actually, or what we have to answer today ... let me—if I'm not mistaken—today we'll try to look at some SubPro recommendations. And earlier when

the SubPro PDP had issued its final report, they recommended that ICANN should establish a [mechanism] that allows a specific party to challenge to challenge or appeal certain types of action or inaction that appear to be inconsistent with the Applicant Guidebook.

And they also recommend that such a limited challenge and appeal mechanism apply to several types of evaluation and [informal judgment decisions] as well, including the DNS stability aspect of evaluation challenge.

So here we are dealing with how or when do we know that a challenge mechanism can or should be forwarded to the DNS Stability Review Team or how we know that we've got to send an appeal to a different entity. So let's say if an applied-for TLD label whose script [inaudible] is supported by the Root Zone Label Generation Rule is determined to be invalid, is that a reason not to use the evaluation challenge processes recommended by SubPro? And if so, rationale must be clear.

And if the SubPro's recommendation on the evaluation challenge process should be used, what are, then, the criteria for filing such a challenge. So this is actually what we have been looking for almost two or three meetings now—that is, mostly three weeks. And we are trying to find all cases where a loser might need to make appeal to a decision and what can be done, and what are all the rights of the user, and who bares the cost, if any, when a user is only lately warned that its applied-for label is not invalid and that then the responsibility must be situated whether this nonvalid TLD is due to the ignorance of the loser that applied for this label, or is that a misapplication of the RZ LGR or simply

that there is, let's say, a bug in the tool that is used to generate the variant.

So [it might at some point] get a little bit complicated or confusing if you are not part of the team. But there is, of course, a working group Wiki that anybody can just go and look and see what they can do. And I'm not seeing the chat. I don't know if there are any questions, Tomslin, because ...

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: There isn't any question.

FARELL FOLLY: Okay. So I can continue. So then the most important thing now that we'll be dealing today, as I said earlier, is Question a3 regarding the consistent definition and technical utilization of the Root Zone Label Generation Rules. We will have to and make decisions or start making decisions about the appeal challenge mechanisms. And the challenge of evaluation outcome will be related to the string similarly DNS stability and some final [inaudible] evaluation, some community priority evaluation, some application support.

And here, for instance, if you think that there are other things that might need to be taken into consideration, there is an opportunity to think about it and to make a suggestion, as some new metrics that need to be taken into account during this evaluation outcome.

And what can I say more? Let me see what I've got here. So, Tomslin, can I share my screen? I'm not sure if I'm a co-hos, but I would like to share my screen so that people can see—these people. It might be difficult to follow what I'll be talking about because it's a flowchart.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I don't know, Maryam, if that's possible.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Hold on a second, Tomslin, please.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, thanks. Can you hear me now?

FARELL FOLLY: Yeah. [I can hear you].

MARYAM BAKOSHI: I can hear you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: I was just checking if Farell can share his screen.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, yes.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: All right, thanks.

MARYAM BAKOSHI: Yes, [inaudible] now. Yes.

FARELL FOLLY: So what I'm now sharing is not yet published, but it will be published by tomorrow because we are going to discuss this. But I think that it might be useful if you guys get some background in case you are going to join the call so that at least you get some background on it.

So most probably, as I said, we are trying to deal with is we get an applied-for gTLD which is found invalid. And what are the responsibilities or what is the affected party? Here we may have the applicant. And then who is the arbiter of the challenge? And what do we do afterwards when the challenge is found valid, when it's found allocatable or not allocatable, and when the string is to be blocked.

And this one for a challenge, you can see here that we got, normally before when we got the new gTLD in 2012, the application process started with an application submission. But now this has to incorporate the use of IDNs. And then we are thinking that the Root Zone Label Generation Rules should be incorporated at this process and then follow the process as before.

But here there are some [tweaks] because how to validate the string and the cost involved, the entity that that involves is a little bit not trivial compared to the previous validation process that we have for the

gTLDs which, at that time, did not incorporate or did not anticipate on the Root Zone Label Generation Rules.

So probably tonight this will be the biggest thing we will be discussing about. I took the risk to present it. It might be changing a little bit because we are still discussing it, but I found it's useful to discuss it now before we get an opportunity in one month in our policy call to come back on it. But again, this is interesting to think about.

So at the start, we get a gTLD label which is submitted for application. And if the tool, the [inaudible] LGR tool found is valid, then it will continue its normal process past the DNS Stability Panel. And then it can proceed to the next stage.

But if there is any issue that comes up. There are two kinds. Either the applicant decides to proceed to submission even though the initial algorithm finds that the applied-for label is invalid and if, [in deciding when to proceed], it needs to pass through administrative completeness and then continue again to the DNS Stability.

And at this [part] here, we are still discussing how and when to send the thing to either the DNS Stability or another ICANN process that allows to deal about this issue because sometimes an applied-for TLD might be found invalid either because the applicant has not understood the tool or there is a bug in the RZ. Or there can also be a misapplication of the RZ Label Generation Tool.

And at a certain stage, maybe the applicant also has borne some costs, and who will take those costs into account? Is that for the loser to take

them into account? Is that to ICANN or is that to an external entity? So those are some questions that we will be discussing tonight. And I wanted to share this draft with you before we can continue.

So if you've got any suggestions/feedback, maybe I can take them into account and raise them tonight during our call tonight or early morning because that's 2:00 or 1:00 A.M. my time.

So I will stop here and again the microphone to Tomslin. And thank you for your attention, and I will be glad to answer any questions that you might have.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you so much, Farell. I don't see any hands up. And I must admit, the IDN is a bit new to NCSG, but it's something that we need to pay attention, of course, to I think the same way we've always paid attention to all the gTLD string.

I did see a question from Stephanie asking who is on the DNS Stability Panel. I don't know if you know the answer because I don't.

FARELL FOLLY:

I don't know, but as she mentioned in the chat is really important because there are many questions that will be, let's say, deferred to this panel. And it's very interesting.

I thought we got some discussion earlier in a policy call, and [you] told me that it had started earlier but that if it's still time to join in or if it's still pertinent, I may consider joining it as well. Maybe not as an active

participant, but at least as observer. So at least I can have some feedback to share.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR: Sure. Thanks so much. Just checking if there's any question or any hands raised. I see Jeff says, "It was an Interisle consult team in 2012. Interise Consulting." Thank you, Jeff. I couldn't read that. Thanks.

FARELL FOLLY: Yes. Stephanie said she's skeptical of the reality of the algorithm transparency. Yes, of course. But I think there are many ways to improve on that transparency because, first of all, for each script there are like panels, like Integration Panels who, with people from the aspect of the script who work together to establish an algorithm because each script has a different algorithm. There are rules as pertaining to how to convert a string or a label into ASCII because an applied-for string can be from any script. You can have Arabic. You can have German or whatever. But there is an algorithm standard for everybody to convert them to code point.

Code points are the names that are used for the ASCII correspondent of any script that can be written. But for the algorithm that will validate this code point to be a valid label for a TLD, this is done by a panel of experts who know about the script itself and who know the rules about how certain similarity within a language can occur. And then this panel, of course, is open to everybody, to the community and also to the call of public comment for their work. And anybody can join them.

So this is a process there to make sure that there will be less bias and then make it more transparent. So I guess to add that on Stephanie's comment.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Farrell. And I just wanted to add on to the last point you made that there are public comment periods for these scripts. And in the past we haven't paid attention to these or tried to comment on them. But there are public comments for each of these once they are ready for integration into the root zone. So I think, actually, right now there are some that are in progress. So if that's something that folks are interested in looking at, they can. If they're from those script communities, that is.

I see the chat alive with trying to identify the correct URL for the DNS Stability Panel. But I don't see any hands up, so we will continue. Thank you, Farrell, for that update and introduction to the work that the IDN PDP is doing.

The other “Other Business” that we have is that we currently have a vacancy on the EPDP IRT. That's the implementation Review Team for EPDP, which Stephanie was our rep in that and she has currently resigned from that role.

And also, on the other one which I cannot ... The Council Committee for Overseeing and Implementing Continuous Improvement (CCOICI). We will also need a rep on that as well, so I'll follow up on the mailing list on these two positions that are vacant. So I just thought that I would

mention them so that folks can start thinking about them before I come to you on the list.

I'll pause there to see if there are any further questions/comments or any hands raised.

Bruna, please go ahead.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thank you so much, Tomslin. Yeah, just to raise my hand more on the note of re-emphasizing how relevant it is for us to get folks in these positions.

Stephanie and Manchu, probably Tatiana, and a lot of us have been slightly overwhelmed with the representations. And I include myself in this group, but if any of you are willing to take a chance in these positions, just let us know and then we can figure out a plan for having somebody at a more starter level—or even a newcomer—into those positions in a way that it's more collective and we can all help.

So if you're interested in what Tomslin just said, we can always figure out a way for you to be onboarded into those things and into NCSG as well. And we can work together in this representation. So, yeah, that's just that. Thank you, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thank you, Bruna. And yes, you're absolutely right. We have no other hands raised. I think, Bruna, I'm guessing that's an old hand. Yeah. All right, thank you.

Thanks, Stephanie, offering to help anyone who is ready to jump on those two roles.

Our last item today is to welcome to this committee ... Okay, Bruna, I'll come to you. Sorry. Not the last item, then. I think, Bruna, you go first before I get to the last item on AOB.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Thanks again, Tomslin. Mine is really quick. Just to let everyone know that we have the NCSG open meeting on Thursday. To meet it's going to be an evening, I think. It should be around 17:00 UTC, and if any of the folks here have suggestions of topics or things we can discuss and should discuss at the NCSG open meeting, I would be deeply appreciative of any suggestions or topics for us to discuss.

I have been trying to mail the list about this, but did not get any kind of response so far on that note. So if you guys have ideas of topics or whatever we can discuss at the open meeting, I am open to receiving them and you're most welcome to do so. So that's it, Thank you so much, Tomslin.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Bruna, for that. So the last item was that I was just going to welcome the new councilor to the Policy Committee—and that's Manchu—and Tatiana, who is leaving the Policy Committee, for all the work she's done. We already did that earlier. But thanks, again. And welcome, Manchu.

That's all I had for today. I don't see any other comments or hands raised. I'll give it a moment to see if anyone would like to ask any question. And if not ...

All right, I see Manchu then Bruna. I hope I got the order correct.

MANCHU CHEN:

Sorry. I just thought maybe I should say something [inaudible]. Thank you for the welcome. I don't know what to say, so thank you very much for welcoming me. And I promise I'll not shame NCSG by representing us and Council. Thank you very much.

Oh, and actually after ... So we have an Accuracy Scoping Team meeting. I don't know which time you are, but maybe an hour later. It's so fun this time because it's during ICANN, so I welcome everybody to join us if you're interested in what accuracy means in registration data. Yeah, please join us because we have open mic during the session. If you have any opinion you want to share, then join us because normally you don't get to do that during those Scoping Team meetings. Thank you very much.

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

Thanks, Manchu. And welcome, again. Bruna, over to you.

BRUNA SANTOS:

Just one other very important thing I forgot to mention in that I'm about to send an e-mail to the list this week. Maryam will no longer work with us. So Maryam will leave the staff position of NCSG [support] this next

week, just right after ICANN72. And Andrea Glandon is coming to help us. So our staff contact points from now on will be Andrew and Brenda Brewer. So they will be our people right now.

But since we're on the farewell note, I would also take this time to thank Maryam for the outstanding work she has done with us and for us for these past years. And also welcome Andrea to the NCSG side. So, really sad to see Maryam go. Happy to see [Brenda] coming. And, yeah, a lot of changes for NCSG [inaudible].

TOMSLIN SAMME-NLAR:

[inaudible] those thoughts, Bruna. Thank you, Maryam, for all the help you've given us through the years. And we will surely miss you. And thank you. Welcome, Andrea. And we'll look forward to working with you.

And with that, we see no other hands. We come to the end of our policy call, then, at ICANN72. Thank you all for coming today, and I wish you a good rest of the meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]